

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 and 12-18 are pending. Claims 7-9 and 16 have been allowed. By this Response, claims 10, 12 and 18 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above-amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 10, 12-15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama, et al. (US 6,346,936) in view of Nishino Kenji (hereinafter "Nishino") (JP 06-121195). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In embodiments of applicant's present invention, the frequency characteristic of the image signal is varied in a periodic manner. This frequency characteristic is altered in a specific way. In embodiments of the invention, the frequency characteristic of the image signal is varied in a periodic manner.

As stated on page 4, lines 3-4 of the Office Action, Murayama et al do not disclose the claimed varying a frequency characteristic of the image signal in a periodic manner. However, the Office Action alleges that Nishino teaches a control circuit receiving an image signal from an image signal processing circuit and varying a frequency characteristic of the image signal in a periodic manner, as recited in independent claim 1. The Office Action also alleges that Nishino teaches periodically varying a frequency characteristic of the image signal by acting directly on the image signal, as recited in independent claim 12. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Office Action alleges that altering of the frequency characteristic as described above is taught by the altering of the voltage generating circuit 10 that generates horizontal and vertical fields in coils L1 and L2. The Office Action refers to the abstract paragraphs 20-23 of Nishino to support its allegation. The Office Action states that the shifting of the display position of the

color image signal does indeed vary the frequency characteristics of the image signal. See page 2, lined 16-22 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that Nishino teaches that an alternating magnetic field is generated at coils L1 and L2, thereby shifting three original colors (red, green, blue) electric beams slightly left and right. The shifting of the electric beam has no connection with the frequency characteristics of the image signal in Nishino. As shown in Fig. 5 of Nishino, three original color electric beams pass between the coils L1 and L2. Since the coils L1 and L2 generate the alternating magnetic field, the traveling directions of the electric beams are varied by the magnetic field force of coils L1 and L2. Thus, in Nishino, the traveling directions of the electric beams are merely bent by the magnetic field force, without varying the frequency characteristics of the image signal.

Furthermore, as shown in Fig. 1 of Nishino, only the horizontal synchronizing signal (HS) and the vertical synchronizing signal (VS), which are separated from the composite synchronizing signal (CS) by the sync separation circuit 1 are input to the moiré cancel circuit 8, and no image signal is input to the moiré cancel circuit 8. From this fact, it is clear that the moiré cancel circuit 8, does not perform any processing on the image signal. Namely, the processing of varying the frequency characteristics of the image signal is not performed in Nishino. Therefore, the present invention's effect of reducing unnecessary radiation cannot be obtained in Nishino.

Therefore, Nishino does not teach or suggest the claimed varying the frequency characteristic of the image signal. Thus, the combined teachings of the Nishino and Murayama references do not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 12, as required.

Also, in independent claims 10 and 18, the step of periodically varying a waveform characteristic is performed when said resolution is higher than a predetermined value and is not performed when said resolution is lower than the predetermined value. In other words, the operation of reducing unnecessary radiation levels by periodically varying the waveform characteristic of the image signal when the resolution is high and suppressing deterioration of the image quality by not varying the waveform characteristic of the image signal when the resolution is low, are performed. This allows for performing a suitable operation in both cases of higher and lower resolution. See page 13, line 27 to page 14, line 11.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Murayama nor Nishino teach or suggest the operation of periodically varying a waveform characteristic of the image signal being performed when the resolution is high and is not performed when the resolution is low. Thus, Nishino and Murayama fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a control circuit receiving said image signal from said image signal processing circuit and varying a waveform characteristic of the image signal in a periodic manner, further comprising a control unit that determines a resolution of the image signal and activates the control circuit when said resolution is higher than a predetermined value and does not activate the control circuit when said resolution is lower than the predetermined value, as recited in claim 10.

Nishino and Murayama also fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, wherein the step of periodically varying said waveform characteristic is performed when said resolution is higher than a predetermined value and is not performed when said resolution is lower than the predetermined value, as recited in claim 18.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Murayama and Nishino fail to teach every feature of applicant's claims as required. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4-12 and 15-18 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_  
D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Rd  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant